

Message 12 of 20

From: To: Date: Subject: wa4ixn@juno.com ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600.

Upgrades

RM-10620

Received: from m5.nyc.untd.com (m5.nyc.untd.com [64.136.22.68])

by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBVBAts04691

for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:55 -0500 (EST)

Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"uiPPpOjxs1EiqWFBG6HhPQ10QRPhQIhjKyMIy44JCDUFnvRe

Received: (from wa4ixn@juno.com)

by m5.nyc.untd.com (jqueuemail) id HMCTMEAY; Tue, 31 Dec 2002 06:10:27 EST

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

Date: Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600

Subject: Upgrades

Message-ID: <20021231.051319.-836001.36.wa4ixn@juno.com>

X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.33 MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-2,43,62,70,88,95,103-108

From: wa4ixn@juno.com

X-UIDL: &Gpd9+<0e9\$;@!!?+Ee9

Status: RO

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the. question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their

exclusive use

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a 00 note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year
O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN
ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH
WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile
WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile





Message 8 of 39

From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>

To: <ak437@acorn.net>

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700

Subject: RM10620

Received: from txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (smtp3.texas.rr.com [24.93.36.231])

by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBUNr9s18440

for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:53:10 -0500 (EST)

Received: from k6cwo (cpe-24-174-215-49.elp.rr.com [24.174.215.49])

by txsmtp03.texas.rr.com (8.12.5/8.12.2) with SMTP id gBUNnqUr015565 for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:49:54 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <00a901c2b05e\$9a914020\$1400a8c0@k6cwo>

From: "CWO3" <cwo3@elp.rr.com>

To: <ak437@acorn.net> Subject: RM10620

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 16:53:08 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="---=_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1106

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106

X-UIDL: QHUd99?f!!^nd!!c]!!

Status: RO

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

----- NextPart 000 00A6 01C2B023.EDD86140

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Dale, I would prefer to address my comments about RM-10620 using a = more direct avenue, at least get you comment first.

I think that your suggestion the establish a rule change that would = advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham radio license holders, = that have held there license for more than twenty years, is admirable, = and at first brush a really great suggestion that would encourage and = recognize deserving individuals.

I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed in April 2000. My = experience since then is that the longer many, not all, ham radio = operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham radio, and = conduct themselves as "elitist". The biggest violation being the use of = the phonetic alphabet. Even when requested many senior hams simply = repeat what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some = unnecessary comment. The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but = that is the most common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked = for.

I agree that with time all active hams learn more about the hobby than = can be found in any book, although I must admit that the available = documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is excellent. As = it relates to the "Novice" class license's...somewhere along the line = they should have learn just enough to take the test for the next level. = As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see that having to = recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve "Extra" = class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham = community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above comment. =

I am confident that you, as are all active ham radio operators. are = familiar with the points I have commented on. I would enjoy a dialogue = with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a public = comment with the FCC.

AR: 3 0 2373



```
Sincerely,
Roland
KECWO
----- NextPart 000 00A6 01C2B023.EDD86140
Content-Type: text/html;
         charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Dwindows-1252">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.2800.1126" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bqColor=3D#d4d0c8>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Hi Dale,&nbsp; I would prefer to =
address my=20
comments about RM-10620 using a more direct avenue, at least get you =
comment=20
first.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I think that your suggestion the establish a =
rule change=20
that would advance by one level "Novice" and "Advance" ham radio =
license=20
holders, that have held there license for more than twenty years, is =
admirable = 20
and at first brush a really great suggestion that would =
encourage and=20
recognize deserving individuals.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I haven't been a ham that long, first licensed =
in April=20
2000. Anbsp; My experience since then is that the longer many, not =
all, ham=20
radio operators are licensed the less they honor the spirit of ham =
radio, and=20
conduct themselves as "elitist".   The biggest violation being the =
use of=20
the phonetic alphabet. Anbsp: Even when requested many senior hams simply =
repeat=20
what ever it is they have become accustom to, or make some unnecessary=20
comment. anbsp; The "elitist" attitude does not end there, but that is =
the most=20
common infraction, or lack of courtesy even when asked for.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I agree that with time all active hams learn =
more about=20
the hobby than can be found in any book, although I must admit that the=20
available documentation on a whole range of ham related topics is=20
excellent.  As it relates to the "Novice" class =
license's...somewhere along=20
the line they should have learn just enough to take the test for the =
next=20
level.   As it applies to the "Advance" class license's I can see =
that=20
having to recall the amount of technical knowledge required to achieve =
"Extra" = 20
class may be a tall order, and if they are in good standing in the ham=20
community, then I agree with your recommendation, with my above=20
comment. </FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>I am confident that you, as are all active ham =
radio=20
operators. are familiar with the points I have commented on.   I =
would enjoy=20
a dialogue with you, so as to listen to your perspective before making a =
public=20
comment with the FCC.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Sincerely,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>Roland</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT face=3DDolphin>K6CWO</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
----=_NextPart_000_00A6_01C2B023.EDD86140--
```





Message 11 of 21

From: "Bob Maser"

'Bob Maser"

'Bob Maser'

'Bob M

To: <ak437@acorn.net>

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 22:49:25 -0500

Subject: RM-10621

Dale, I disagree with your proposal RM-10621 just as much as I disagreed with the no code Extra. And I still think that it was a slap in the face for those of us that had to get to that 20 WPM level in order to be able to use DX frequencies. This latest proposal of yours makes no sense at all. The way I look at it, if you fail the driving test for 20 years you still shouldn't be given a license to drive until you learn well enough to pass the test. Anyone who has been an Advanced for 20 years either doesn't have the interest in putting in the effort or has probably been inactive for most of that time. We all seem to be so concerned that this great hobby of ours is getting obsolete that we are willing to drop the price of admission so that anyone can get on the air. If you would take the time to listen around the bands, you can hear testimony that the hobby is becoming almost as bad as CB.

Sincerely, Bob Maser W6TR





Message 15 of 21

From: To: W2RRT@aol.com

To:
Date:
Subject:

ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Tue, 31 Dec 2002 19:41:48 EST

(no subject)

Hi Dale,

I have just read your petition RM-10620 and I think it's great on your request and feelings on that particular subject. I don't know what the FCC feelings is going to be.

But what ever it is I thank you for trying. I have been a "HAM" for 56 years and cannot believe they (FCC) would do such a change with NO REWARDS for the extra license. All they did was degrade the licensing system by demoting the class "A" status to a lower level with NO explanation. I WILL NEVER TAKE THE EXTRA CLASS TEST. Those are my personal feelings. In any event, thaks again for your interest and petition.

sincerly and best 73's Nick Harris W2RRT W2RRT@aol.com ••

JAN 3 (1 224)

MailMan Script Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation
Interface Copyright © 1997 - 1999 Endymion Corporation and Hypnopaedia Studios.
Microcompanies With Attitude



angle



Message 10 of 39

From:

Kg6bdj@cs.com

To: Date: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 EST

Subject:

RM-10620

Received: from imo-m02.mx.aol.com (imo-m02.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.5])

by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBV1rDs27995

for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:13 -0500 (EST)

Received: from Kg6bdj@cs.com

by imo-m02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v34.13.) id i.c9.2dda5a8b (16335) for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 -0500 (EST)

From: Kg6bdj@cs.com

Message-ID: <c9.2dda5a8b.2b425280@cs.com>

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 EST

Subject: RM-10620

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 32-bit sub 112

X-UIDL: [3=1!<=/e9NT7!!Hj)!!

Status: RO

Dale; I agree with all of your proposal except, advancing the Advanced ticket holders. These are the last of the licenses that had to be earned. Now adays anyone with 5 words and a good memory (or a little luck), can get an Extra class ticket. Just my opinion. Thanks for listening, de Dennis KG6BDJ



RM-10620

Message 9 of 39

From: To: Date: Subject: JOchmann@aol.com ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST General Class?

Received: from imo-r03.mx.aol.com (imo-r03.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.99]) by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBUNxTs18988 for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:30 -0500 (EST) Received: from JOchmann@aol.com by imo-r03.mx.aol.com (mail out v34.13.) id i.11.5eb4f34 (16633) for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 -0500 (EST) From: JOchmann@aol.com Message-ID: <11.5eb4f34.2b4237de@aol.com> Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 18:59:26 EST Subject: General Class? To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1 11.5eb4f34.2b4237de boundary" X-Mailer: AOL 8.0 for Windows US sub 230 X-UIDL: =55e9@A0e95\7!!@> d9 Status: RO --part1_11.5eb4f34.2b4237de_boundary Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit Dale,

If your recommendation were to pass, would it include Generals as well?

Ü

John....a.k.a. WA8NDL

--part1_11.5eb4f34.2b4237de_boundary Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII" Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<HTML><BODY BGCOLOR="#fffffff"><FONT style="BACKGROUND-COLOR: #fffffff" SIZE=2

If your recommendation were to pass, would it include Generals as well?

 $\verb§£nbsp; $

--part1_11.5eb4f34.2b4237de_boundary--

I believe this proposal to be a fair & needed change! Any Advance class ham with 20 or more years experience should be well qualified to operate with Extra Class privilages. I've held an Advanced Class ticket for over 50 years as it was the highest available at the time and would be glad to match my knowledge on the use and responsibilities of Amateur Radio with any new Extra Class holder! W6DOM

JN1 5 0 2003



Message 17 of 20

From:

"Billy Cox" <wa4fny@charter.net>

To: Date: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us> Thu, 2 Jan 2003 13:50:40 -0500

Subject:

QRZ:

Hi Dale, K8AD,

Having read what RM-10620 and RM 10621 are all about in ARRL OB-74, I STRONGLY AGREE. I tried to send an emaill response to the FCC. I found out that they can do all kinds of damage to you. One item of contention is a problem with the FILE DATE. Next, I need to file with the FCC each RM, individually. I hope you can help..by sending me this information.

Billy D. Cox, WA4FNY wa4fny@charter.net





The second secon

UNU 3 0 2003

Message 20 of 20

From:

<k5zol@earthlink.net>

To:

ak437@acorn.net

Date:

Thu, 02 Jan 2003 12:48:17 -0800

Subject:

Re: UR FCC petition

. Depots Committees

I went to their website. Is making comments easier than it looks? Looked like I'd have to spend some time learning their system and getting things in the format they accept?

I would like to comment, but have never done that before.

K5ZOL

On Thu, 2 Jan 2003 15:39:17 US/Eastern ak437@acorn.net wrote:

```
>
> Please have your comments filed on line at the
> FCC ECFS page.
> Any additional input would be help!
> If you have any other changes you feel should
> be blended into
> this please make your point line by line so
> they have public
> input.
> Thanks Again
> Dale Reich - k8ad
> > I think your upgrade petition makes a lot of
> sense. goodluck.
> > 73,
> >
> > Bob K5ZOL
>
 >
>
> ------
> This message was sent using ACORN.net, a
> service of the
> Akron-Summit County Public Library.
> http://www.acorn.net
>
```





Message 12 of 20

exclusive use.

From:

wa4ixn@juno.com

To: Date: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Tue, 31 Dec 2002 05:13:12 -0600

Subject:

Upgrades

Hi Dale,

Your proposal is good. Most hams don't realize that the exams have become easier through the years. The purpose being to swell the ranks with new hams without making it too difficult for them. In the "good-old-days" the exams were more technically oriented to the kind of equipment one would expect to be operating. A lot of which would be built from scratch or converted from military equipment. Rules and regulations weren't such a large portion of the exams. Neither was a lot of algebraic calculation that had little or no use in the 'real world' of ham radio. It seems now that the 'wizards' who sit and dream up the question pools are looking for electronic engineer types instead of ordinary people who just want to enjoy the hobby and talk to others of the same ilk down the street or around the world. I've been saying -too loudly sometimes -- that if you want to play the moon bounce, ham TV, microwave, satellite games, etc., then fine. Study up on the required technology and go for it. But don't take chunks of the ordinary bands away from those of us who studied hard for the exams of 30, 40, 50 years ago, with the bent toward punched steel, hand wired, tube filled chassis, and earned the privilege and used the whole band to good purpose, just to glorify your urge to expand your knowledge. I don't know if you were around back in the 1960's when, with the full support of the ARRL, the 'blue-bloods' of ham radio crammed their desire for "incentive licensing" down the throat of the FCC and took big chunks of the bands away from the majority of hams who were, for the most part, much more active in actually using those frequencies than they were. It took a lot of hard-nosed politicking and a lot of money in the right places, but they got it done over the cries of despair from the 'average' hams and even from such notables as Barry Goldwater who was very active in the efforts to stop the breaking up of the bands. A good 'for instance' would be: You've been a licensed driver for 20 or 30 years and have exercised the privileges of your license by driving any road you want, from one end to the other, including the superhighways and interstates, in your good old Ford or Chevy. Suddenly, a bunch of wealthy executives of the black tie and tails group with their Mercedes and Jaguars decide to change things more in their favor. If you can't, or don't want to, come up to their standard, then they are going to pressure the highway department into kicking you off the roads you have driven ever since you got your license. From now on you can only drive on the back roads and be crowded into grid block traffic while the high-and-mighty who meet the new standard they set for themselves get the full use of all the roads, including the almost vacant portions they've set aside for their

I studied hard. I build radios from scratch and scrap. I learned all I could about communications. I took and passed on the first go-around both the Novice and the General exams. Since then, over the past fifty (50) years, I've probably built more radio equipment from junk-box parts and from kits than any dozen of those so-called "super ham" Advanced and



Extra class types. About the only things Heathkit made between 1955 (when I first could afford to buy them) and when they closed their doors in the mid '70s that I didn't build right out of the box was their television sets and stereo music boxes. The same for Knight kits and several Eico transceivers. Even now, at age 66, I still get the honor of handling the high-speed Morse on field day. Out of 69 club members there are only 3 of us who can handle more than 10 wpm. And I still use, almost exclusively, Morse in my daily operation. I don't use a keyer or a keyboard. I still use a 20-year-old Vibroplex (have worn out 3 of them), or when mobile an old WW-II leg-clamp J-38. I normally cruise along at 35-40 wpm, except with the J-38, and slow down only to work and help a Novice or Tech-plus learn code. I do have a microphone (D-104) on my desk, but it has a plastic cover on it and hasn't been used more than once in the last couple of years.

Yes, I am considering moving up to Extra Class, I've looked at the books and the question pool. To tell the truth, I have no use at all for satellites, TV, microwave, etc., and I find the high mathematics required just to regain the lost spectrum that I worked hard for 50 years ago, and feel I didn't deserve to have taken away from me, to be just so much useless garbage. I may be forced to learn all that algebraic gibberish to get my frequencies back, but I'll never use it and will toss the books in the trash the moment the exam is passed.

That brings me to the point of this letter. Why did you only specify advancing Novice and Advanced Class licensees?? There are thousands of General Class bums like me out here who are still burning at the stake over having our hard earned frequencies yanked away from us 35 years ago for the sake of a handful of nerds who only wanted the apportionment for their private use and who spend most of their time playing in the GHz bands anyway. We would love to be able to work the low ends and middle of the 80, 40, 20, and 15 meter bands again. To be able to spread out a bit so it would be so crowded all the time with everybody jammed in to small segments of the bands. Why not allow for General Class hams with 20 or more years of experience and clean records to get 'merit advancement' up to Extra Class too. I think that my 50 + years as a General (the highest class there was when I took the exam) and being highly active, especially in ARES, RACES, and Skywarn, with no violations or warnings and not even a 00 note on my record, should count for something worthwhile rather than a 'look-down-the-nose from the hoity-toities of the modern super-hams, many of whom act as if they are the only ones deserving any operating privileges at all.

I think I'll get down off my soapbox now. This subject is one that I have been extremely angry and outspoken on for many years, and likely will continue to be so. I apologize if you feel I've overstepped the bounds of propriety here, but I'm not one to beat around the bush when it comes to something I think is important and will help improve the operating quality and morale of the majority of affected Amateur Radio operators.

Believe me. I have no quarrel with you as an Extra Class. I know you worked hard for it and deserve all the extra privileges it provides. I just think there are many of us out here who deserve more than the short shrift we got at the hands of a few holier-than-thou's who took command of the bands 35 years ago, with the able assistance of the ARRL pushing the buttons at the FCC. There's just not too many of us left now who have the strength left to fight anymore. When the last of us is SK it will all be over.

73 & Happy New Year
O. B. Wolf - WA4IXN
ex: 5A1TS, TA4RZ, DL4NH

WA4IXN/XV Air Mobile WA4IXN/HZ Air Mobile

In the matter of RM-10620:

Dick Bash, KL7IHP did more for Amateur Radio than many people realize. Despite outcries of foul by both the ARRL and the FCC his books and forms of study far exceeded anything out then or now. Shortly after he stopped publishing, the ARRL and other publishers, began publishing the Q&A's for all license classes (strange move). None have done a better job at assisting radio operators to learn and advance through the license structure than Dick. Why do I bring this up?

I earned my Novice license in 1974. I quickly upgraded to General class and during my Master of Education/Counseling program upgraded in 1978 to Advanced class operator. I found his material to be interesting, informative and unusually witty. It was these wits that lead me to my next step in Ham Radio; that of Lead Instructor for a local Ham Radio club. I began with a budget of \$100 for the purchase of study materials and search for a location for the classes. By the time I was finished I had set up a cadre of 6 plus instructors that covered the fields they were strongest in, used the materials of the ARRL, AMECO and others as references, established a site at a local high school where a classroom was attached to an old FM radio station (soon converted to a Ham Radio club station), ran classes practically year round that averaged 22 participants at a time, lead numerous field trips to Amateur radio stores and events and watched well over 200 people get licensed or upgrade. We taught license classes from Novice to Extra Class and people could enter at anytime and not be left behind. They were worked with until licensed. Licensing was a clean process then. Today it is awfully muddled.

During this entire time I strongly opposed loosing Morse code as a prerequisite for licensing, but still assisted those who wanted to become code free Technician class licensees. Most found code to be easy to learn and beneficial to their advancement. I haven't been too happy with the current mood of the League or the FCC as it relates to Amateur radio either (especially the license structure). Dick Bash was the main drive in our desire to assist others. His impetuses lead us in many ways. Make the training process educational and enjoyable. I have pride in the work that was done and the people I worked with.

The ARRL among others have assisted the FCC in "streamlining" the licensing structure. Change is inevitable, but it is not always the end product. The Code requirement for advancement is still present, yet weakened. The testing is still present, yet weakened. The Advanced class written test, up until present was more difficult than today's Extra class exam and, yes, 13 wpm truly is far better than today's 5 wpm requirement.

I for one am not interested in giving out handouts, but we must be realistic in what the ultimate goal of the FCC is. Restructuring of the Amateur radio classes. Well, let's get about completing this "streamlining" process. Take one step closer to an end product with licensure. Get it over with and follow the spirit of the proposed rule making. Recognize the Novice operators for their work, passing of Morse code, time learning and move them into the Technician Plus class of operators. Recognize the Advanced class operators for their Morse code achievements, advanced knowledge and practices and move them into Extra class status. Forget waiting twenty years, do it immediately upon their renewal. KL7IHP started something over thirty years ago that has now taken shape. Finish it!

Phil Hartz, K0RVD (ex-WD0FFX)

MailMan: "RM-10620" Page 1 of 1



Message 14 of 22

From:

"AL MAC KENZIE" < WB6BBH@arrl.net>

To: Date: <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us> Tue, 31 Dec 2002 14:39:47 -0800

Subject:

RM-10620

KUDOS TO YOU DALE TO GET AN RM FROM THE FCC I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE COMMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE PROPOSAL BUT IT WONT WORK FOR ME. ONCE AGAIN THE FCC MAKES THIER E MAIL FORM TO COMPLICATED. I SUPPLIED ALL THEY WANTED & GET THE ANSWER THAT MY NAME ADDRESS & ZIP CODE ARE IN ERROR. I CERTAINLY DID TRY. I HAVE READ THE ARRL BULLETIN ON SEVERAL HF NETS & DO HOPE THOSE THAT MAKE THIER COMMENTS ARE SUCCESFULL.

HAPPY NEW YEAR

73 88 AL**ALICE**

ARRL BULLETIN MANAGER-ORANGE SECTION

www.qsl.net/arrl-orange/ www.3952khz.net WB6BBH@arrl.net

REVAY

David A. Orienti W4BHM

1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226
(205) 822-2114 (H) (205) 529-9820 (C)
Email - orienti@bellsouth.net

w4bhm@bellsouth.net

P (5 0 2003

January 3, 2003

F.C.C. Washington, DC

Re: Response to petition for rule making # RM-10620 from K8AD

CODE SPEED

I would like to add my opinion to the above-mentioned petition. I support this petition for the following reasons:

When I upgraded from General Class to Advanced Class back in the 70's as W8LTE, the only difference between the Advanced test and the Extra test was the 20wpm code test. Therefore, I passed the same written exam as I would have been given for upgrade to Extra Class. With the changes in code speed currently in effect, I have, in fact, passed the Extra Class license test but am only licenses as an Advanced Class operator.

Since the Advanced Class is no longer available and since I already have passed the Extra Class written test in effect at the time of my testing, I feel that I should be "upgraded" to Extra Class status.

Sincerely,

David Orienti
W4BHM
1722-B Valpar Drive
Birmingham, AL. 35226-2344

CENTRAL CLASS - 13 WPM + WR

ADVIANCED CLASS - ZO WPM + WR

ZO WPM + WR

CHASS - SWPM

CUASS - SWPM

CUASS - SWPM

CUASS - CLASS



Message 4 of 22

From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500

Subject: Amateur licensing

Received: from m5.nyc.untd.com (m5.nyc.untd.com [64.136.22.68])

by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with SMTP id gBSEd0s29313

for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:39:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from cookie.juno.com by cookie.juno.com for <"ljaj/63Gb00f13I0IA9nvzo9LzmTjaBCSlc069MbEHQOFNaD

Received: (from halbwade@juno.com)

by m5.nyc.untd.com (jqueuemail) id HL5GCY3E; Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:38:56 EST

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Date: Sat, 28 Dec 2002 09:40:03 -0500

Subject: Amateur licensing

Message-ID: <20021228.094005.-4148557.2.halbwade@juno.com>

X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=--__JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 8-6,7-8,11-12,22-23,28-29,32-33,36-37,41-46,47-32767

From: Harold B Wade <halbwade@juno.com>

X-UIDL: /U\!!^hVd9CPN!!\#*!!

Status: RO

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

---- __JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Dale

I saw a reference to you and your recommendation on license upgrades for advanced class in yesterdays ARRL bulletin, and have a comment to make on that.

Over fifty years ago, 1949, I was licensed as class "A", which required code proficiency at twenty words per minute, and a stiff written exam. At the same time I held a FCC commercial license for radio telegraphy, also requiring twenty words per minute. I also held FCC commercial license for radiotelephone operation. All these licenses required testing for knowledge far in excess of any of our current amateur licenses. We had to draw complete schematic diagrams for power supplies, oscillators, amplifiers etc. We had to trouble shoot equipment from diagrams supplied by the FCC. We had to receive AND send code in the presence of an FCC examiner to his satisfaction.

I was a graduate of the USAF Radio Operator school (32 weeks) which required code proficiency of twenty five words per minute for a minimum passsing grade. I was also a graduate of the USAF Radio Mechanic school (36 weeks) requiring extensive knowledge of electronics hardware and circuitry.

What I am leading up to here, is that I was more than a little miffed when the FCC changed my license class to Advanced and I learned I would have to do more testing to recover my lost operating privileges.

I suppose it amounts to an attitude problem on my account, but so far I have declined to submit to any further testing in the interest of operating privileges.

Another federal agency, The FAA, recognizes military training, experience and proficiency. I am licensed as a commercial pilot by the FAA, but I have never ridden with an FAA examiner. The FAA issued the license based on my USAF rating as a pilot.

Thanks and good luck in your endeavors.

```
73
Hal Wade
W4NVO
     _JNP_000_1b1c.4b72.79be
Content-Type: text/html; charset = us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; charset=3Dwindows-=</pre>
1252">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4522.1800" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD>
<BODY bottomMargin=3D0 leftMargin=3D3 topMargin=3D0 rightMargin=3D3>
<DIV><STRONG>Hi Dale</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I saw a reference to you and your recommendation on license=20
upgrades for advanced class in yesterdays ARRL bulletin, and have a comment=
to=20
make on that.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Over fifty years ago, 1949, I was licensed&nbsp;as class "A", =
which=20
required  code proficiency at twenty words per minute, and a stiff =
written=20
exam. At the same time I held a FCC commercial license for radio telegraphy=
, = 20
also requiring twenty words per minute. I also held FCC commercial license =
radiotelephone operation. All these licenses required testing for =
knowledge=20
far in excess of  any of our current amateur licenses. We  had to =
draw=20
complete schematic diagrams for power supplies, oscillators, amplifiers etc=
 . We=20
had to trouble shoot equipment from diagrams supplied by the FCC.   &=
nbsp:We=20
had to receive AND send code in the presence of an FCC examiner to his=20
satisfaction. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I was a graduate of the USAF Radio Operator school (32 weeks) =
which=20
required code proficiency of twenty five words per minute for a minimum =
passsing=20
grade. </STRONG><STRONG>I was also a graduate of the USAF Radio Mechanic =
school=20
(36 weeks) requiring extensive knowledge of electronics hardware and=20
circuitry.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>What I am leading up to here, is that I was more than a little=
miffed when the FCC changed my license class to Advanced and I learned I =
would=20
have to do more testing to recover my lost operating privileges.&mbsp;=20
</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>I suppose it amounts to an attitude problem on my account, but=
 so=20
far I have declined to submit to any further testing in the interest of=20
operating privileges. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG></STRONG>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Another federal agency, The FAA, recognizes military training,=
experience and proficiency. I am licensed as a commercial pilot by the FAA,=
I have never ridden with an FAA examiner. The FAA issued the license based =
on my=20
USAF rating as a pilot. </STRONG></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Thanks and good luck in your endeavors.</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>73</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>Hal Wade</STRONG></DIV>
<DIV><STRONG>W4NVO</STRONG></DIV>
```

Page 3 of 3

<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>
----_JNP_000_lblc.4b72.79be--





Message 5 of 20

From:

"John E. Feltz" < jfw9jn@tznet.com>

To:

<ak437@acorn.net>

Date:

Sat, 28 Dec 2002 08:11:37 -0600

Subject:

rm10620

Hi dale

I concur with your petition in its entirety. Please may I have the FCC address or web site so I can also add my two cents in this endeavor. I will ask other hams in the area to also see this proposal. Thanks.

73, John W9JN



MailMan: "RM-10620" Page 1 of 1



Message 10 of 20

From:

Kg6bdj@cs.com

To: Date: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 EST

Subject:

RM-10620

Received: from imo-m02.mx.aol.com (imo-m02.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.5])

by acorn.net (8.11.6+Sun/8.11.6) with ESMTP id gBV1rDs27995

for <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:13 -0500 (EST)

Received: from Kg6bdj@cs.com

by imo-m02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v34.13.) id i.c9.2dda5a8b (16335)

for <ak437@mail.acorn.net>; Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 -0500 (EST)

From: Kg6bdj@cs.com

Message-ID: <c9.2dda5a8b.2b425280@cs.com>

Date: Mon, 30 Dec 2002 20:53:04 EST

Subject: RM-10620

To: ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 32-bit sub 112

X-UIDL: [3=!!<=/e9NT7!!Hj)!!

Status: RO

Dale; I agree with all of your proposal except, advancing the Advanced ticket holders. These are the last of the licenses that had to be earned. Now adays anyone with 5 words and a good memory (or a little luck), can get an Extra class ticket. Just my opinion. Thanks for listening, de Dennis KG6BDJ

